

**SUMMARIZED MINUTES
SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING**



**THURSDAY, JANUARY 19, 2006
KIVA – CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251**

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:09 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chairman Mark Gilliland
Vice-Chairman Brian Davis
Commissioner Michael Bruz
Commissioner J. David Hill
Commissioner William Howard
Commissioner Kelly McCall

ABSENT: Commissioner Matthew Taunton

STAFF PRESENT: Rose Arballo, Transportation Commission Coordinator
Teresa Huish, Principal Transportation Planner
Dave Meinhart, Transportation Planning and Transit Director
Mary O'Connor, Transportation General Manager
Paul Porell, Traffic Engineering Director

OTHER: Paul Basha, Morrison Maierle
Charlie Hales, Project Manager - HDR

CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Scottsdale Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Gilliland at 6:09 p.m.

1. **ROLL CALL**

A formal roll call confirmed the members present as stated above.

2. **APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES**

With regard to the minutes for the November 17, 2005 meeting, Commissioner McCall confirmed with Mr. Porell that the final sentence of the fifth full paragraph on page 11 should read as follows: "With the additional developments north of the Crown project that would use the East Ranch Gate alignment, volumes would be a lot less if Alameda were not a public street."

Commissioner McCall noted that on the minutes for the regular Commission meeting of December 15, 2005, during the discussion on the Transportation Master Plan Draft Public Engagement Plan/Process, Ms. Huish did, in fact, go over the tentative list of organizations during the meeting. The sixth paragraph on page 3 should be edited to reflect this.

At the top of page 4, there is a listing of the groups that Commissioner McCall believes should be consulted in the process. The group to represent the downtown area and the Waterfront area is missing from that list.

COMMISSIONER MCCALL MOVED TO APPROVE THE AMENDED MINUTES FOR THE STUDY SESSIONS AND THE REGULAR MEETINGS FOR NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER. COMMISSIONER HOWARD SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF 6 (SIX) TO 0 (ZERO).

3. **TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN**

Ms. Huish presented an update on the Transportation Master Plan scope and public engagement process. She introduced Mr. Charlie Hales, Principal with HDR, who described the elements of the public engagement process.

Commissioner Howard asked whether the Transportation Master Plan is for the Scottsdale Road corridor or for the entire City. Mr. Hales explained that the high capacity transit component is focused on the Scottsdale Road corridor.

Commissioner McCall noted there was a lot of material to review before the meeting. Her questions related to these handouts. On page 12, the limits of the Airpark area are defined. She queried whether Hayden Road should be a boundary. Ms. Huish replied that recently, the boundary was moved from Hayden Road to the Pima - Loop 101 freeway.

Commissioner McCall said she did not understand the first sentence on page 13. Ms. Huish explained that the northern area of Scottsdale is defined as the area north, east and west of the Pima Freeway.

Commissioner McCall asked for an explanation of the term "GIS coverage." Ms. Huish explained that this stands for "geographic information system," which is a map-oriented database that staff will be able to use to document their findings.

Commissioner McCall asked about the section of school bus routes and what is meant by "staff school audits results." Mr. Porell replied that transportation staff

go out to each of the schools in the community at peak morning and afternoon times to observe and analyze traffic patterns. Ms. O'Connor added that a new federal program, Safe Routes To School, supports programs to provide safe vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit access to schools. Staff has participated in training and is looking to expand that program. Commissioner McCall commented that parking is a big problem at Scottsdale schools whenever large numbers of visitors attend events.

Looking at the draft public engagement plan, Commissioner McCall suggested that the public educational workshops be scheduled for a Saturday and on a different day of the week.

Commissioner McCall noted that appendix A and B are mentioned but were not included in the draft materials. Ms. O'Connor confirmed they are not yet ready for distribution.

Commissioner Bruz asked Mr. Hales to expand on the slide about the workshops that makes reference to "reactions to tested alternatives." Mr. Hales replied that technical work in terms of testing would take place over the summer after the first workshop in April. Transportation modeling will be a part of this analysis. The policy and community choice issues will be the purview of the Commission.

Commissioner Bruz asked how they will determine what is acceptable and what is not. Mr. Hales explained that technical aspects such as network capacity would be presented to the Commission and workshop participants in September after the analysis has been performed.

Noting that quite an array of public meetings and involvement is planned, Vice-Chair Davis asked Mr. Hales to explain what is being done and for what purpose. Mr. Hales replied that the educational workshops are not primarily geared to solicit input, but to provide information and stimulate discussion. The two multi-day workshops are intensive. Ms. Huish explained that the community and individual meetings are ongoing. Staff expects to get a list of about 200 people that the consultants can interview. Ms. O'Connor added that in addition to the master plan as a whole, area studies are also being done and stakeholder groups are easily defined for these.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked whether the community working group meetings would be open to the public. Ms. O'Connor replied that any meeting is a public meeting. However, the community working groups are intended to get input and feedback. This is meant to be a loose process that allows staff to get as much input as possible while making effective use of staff and consultants.

In response to a further question from Vice-Chair Davis, Ms. Huish said that the three area studies are part of this process. The high capacity transit study takes up where the Major Investment Study ended with Council adoption of a high capacity corridor in February 2003. Ms. O'Connor added that she had been involved directly with the first phase of the high capacity transit study before working for the City. No technology option was selected in the first phase, but potential technologies were reviewed and three technologies were identified for

further consideration at the conclusion of the study. Phase 2 will look at three technology options: light rail transit, bus rapid transit, and modern streetcars.

Vice-Chair Davis asked Ms. O'Connor whether there is an opportunity to consider any other technology. She replied that the City has studied high capacity options since 1996; in order to come up with a plan that can be implemented. Staff recommends focusing on the three technologies that were recommended for further consideration in 2003.

Commissioner Hill asked Mr. Hales to explain the charrette process. Mr. Hales explained that the literal meaning in French is a little cart. Student architects in Paris would wheel their drawings through the streets in a cart. They would hurry along in a group still drawing as they moved through the streets in order to meet their deadlines. This intensive cram session approach to developing a product makes sense in the public process. Architects have used this approach for a while and it has now moved into the planning field. Today it consists of brainstorming with the public and getting the technical staff to work as a team in an intensive, interdisciplinary way.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether there is a specific time frame for the Transportation Master Plan. Ms. Huish said that staff is looking at possibly a 20-year planning horizon with some immediate components. In answer to a further question from Chairman Gilliland, Ms. O'Connor said it is important to ensure that the Transportation Master Plan and Proposition 400 plans mesh. Linkage to the City's General Plan is very important. The role of redevelopment plays a large part in this plan. Bicycle and pedestrian plans have not been looked at since 1994. Additionally, some of the area studies that have been identified are meant to address inconsistencies and incongruities among plans. Even the 2003 plans need to reflect changes.

Mr. Hales noted he would add that if a transit technology is chosen for the Scottsdale Road corridor, bicycle and pedestrian planning need to be keyed to that.

Chairman Gilliland asked Ms. O'Connor if there are any ideas on how the 101 freeway will be handled. She agreed that the freeway system in some respects is a constraint. Chairman Gilliland commented that he would like to see the ITS element rolled into the Streets Master Plan.

Ms. O'Connor confirmed that the process will conclude with a public hearing process to be conducted by the Transportation Commission and finally by City Council. Although not officially part of the General Plan, the Transportation Master Plan is an adjunct to the General Plan.

Chairman Gilliland commented it would be very educational to see some of the results and testing, and to be able to know the costs associated with different options.

Commissioner Howard asked whether a schedule of public meetings would be available. Ms. Huish replied that not all the dates have been set. Once staff has information, it will be sent to all Commissioners.

Commissioner Howard said he is concerned that there is a focus on coming up with a single plan. How does staff consider the alternatives? Mr. Hales answered that this is a key point. The actual process is never as precise as the flow chart implies. It is important that the public and the decision making bodies perceive the alternatives and choices to be made. By the time the public hearing process takes place in a year's time, he expects that a preferred plan will be presented. It is important that the public know why that choice was made and what considerations went into that decision.

Mr. Meinhart added that preferred alternatives are not expected to be the same across the whole City. Commissioner Howard said he understands it is a complex endeavor.

Vice-Chair Davis asked how staff envisions integrating land use planning and transportation planning. Mr. Meinhart said that the Transportation Master Plan would reflect the realities of existing land uses as well as future land uses included in the City's adopted General Plan. Vice-Chair Davis asked whether the Transportation Department has input into development projects. Mr. Meinhart said that staff reviews new development projects on a weekly basis. A goal of the Transportation Master Plan is to provide more clarity and understanding of what should be expected of a development when it comes through the review process.

Ms. O'Connor added that the concept of not having a "one size fits all" plan helps staff do a better job. They recognize how the land use should drive the type of transportation recommendations and choices.

Ms. Huish told Vice-Chair Davis that the Transportation Master Plan website is expected to be online within a couple weeks.

4. **TRAFFIC CALMING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

Mr. Porell introduced Mr. Paul Basha, who addressed the Commission on traffic calming. He noted that Scottsdale has a history of excellent application on traffic calming and made a presentation based on the information Commissioners had received in their packet.

Referring to the sample initial petition included in the packet, Commissioner Bruz noted he could think of situations where a citizen might want traffic calming on a street other than his own. Mr. Basha said his firm is suggesting that a person should only request traffic calming if he is willing to accept it on his own street. Anybody who signs a petition should go through the thought process and consider whether he/she would tolerate traffic calming on their own street. This does not necessarily mean that traffic calming would be implemented on that street.

Commissioner Bruz asked Mr. Basha to clarify the ranking of agencies. Mr. Basha replied they are ranked in order. Sarasota, Florida has, in his opinion, the best traffic calming policy of the 30 agencies that were examined. Scottsdale has quite a good policy that needs some refinement. The City was not among the agencies they evaluated.

In answer to another question by Commissioner Bruz, Mr. Basha explained that a raised intersection is a speed hump that covers the entire length and width of an intersection. There are several in the City currently.

Commissioner Bruz asked staff what the schedule is now for adoption of traffic calming policies and procedures. Mr. Porell said they are looking for input from the Commission. Ms. O'Connor said that staff would like the Commission to consider communication methods, petitions, and interim measures. She suggested that the Commissioners might annotate the draft document so that a revised draft could be released for public comment and input. She recommended that a working version of the draft be adopted and that perhaps it could be incorporated in the Transportation Master Plan adoption process.

Commissioner Bruz thanked Mr. Basha for his efforts. Commissioner Howard said he has done a wonderful job. He commented that turning these into a hard and fast procedure is where the challenge lies. The nature of the street should also be taken into consideration. By drawing up a precise hard and fast policy, common sense may be lost. He was also concerned about the issue of defining affected area. This is potentially very complex. People who depend on a road as their only means of ingress and egress are stakeholders, and their needs must be respected. He agrees with Ms. O'Connor that the nature of the focus group information needs to be looked at, because only 20 to 25 people were involved in four meetings. This is not enough to draw conclusions about the success or failure of the City's traffic calming procedure.

Mr. Basha responded that this point is well taken. He agreed completely that people who drive on a street have a right to be heard but was not convinced that they have a right of veto. This is a difficult matter. Mr. Basha and Ms. O'Connor had discussed whether traffic calming should be restricted to streets with driveways on them.

Commissioner McCall thanked Mr. Basha for his interesting presentation. She asked about the "affected area" column in the ranking criteria. Mr. Basha replied that the determination of an affected area is made by the entity labeled in the column. Ms. McCall said she is concerned because determining the affected area seems to be a very big problem in Scottsdale. This has implications for the petition process. She felt that the statement in Step 3, "The City of Scottsdale identifies a neighborhood and parameters of concern," should be more defined.

Mr. Basha agreed that determination of the affected area is a critical item that has not been addressed. Ms. O'Connor elaborated that the controversial Mountain View process was not typical. Many projects are on local residential streets. Ms. O'Connor wanted to make sure that everyone understood that the definition of affected area is not always complex.

Commissioner McCall asked whether staff have any ideas on how this would be addressed to update the current neighborhood traffic management manual. Ms. O'Connor said that staff recognizes the need for some commonsense latitude so that simple cases can be resolved more quickly. The current policy is more defined and rigid. Mr. Basha commented that notification is important. Any traffic-calming project needs to ensure that anyone who typically would use that street needs to be included in the conversation. The policy needs to differentiate between the cases where it is easy to define the affected area and cases where it is much more complex. People need to know that they are being listened to and their opinion does matter. He added that none of the agencies his firm reviewed has a good answer to this question.

Chairman Gilliland noted that the Commission gets to consider the more complex traffic calming issues. The policy needs to include the intent of the definition of affected area. The current materials are a good first draft of the nuts and bolts of the policy, but the policy needs to be general enough that it can be applied with some needed flexibility. The current policy has lacked adopted rules, which is frustrating to the public. He remarked that the interim measures that are available should be integrated into one document so that people can be aware of all the tools available and what steps they need to take.

Ms. O'Connor said that was a good point. Currently the speed awareness program is run out of the Citizen and Neighborhood Resources Department. She acknowledged that the website needs improvement. These are communication issues rather than a flaw in the policy or procedures.

Chairman Gilliland noted that monitoring and time frames for evaluation should be added to the policy. There might be some instances where it would be appropriate to use test installations. He asked Ms. O'Connor for her thoughts on the Transportation Commission's involvement.

Ms. O'Connor replied that in the past the Commission has been involved in the controversial traffic calming cases. The alternative would be for every traffic-calming project to come before the Commission. There are pros and cons to both options. It would be for the Transportation Commission to make the decision.

Vice-Chair Davis commented that if sound policy and procedures are established and followed, the Commission would not need to be involved in every decision. He would like the Commission to set policy rather than be involved in every operational decision. He agreed that the emphasis needs to be on policy and procedure and that there needs to be room for flexibility and common sense.

Commissioner Hill thanked Mr. Basha for the enlightening presentation. He agreed that staff could deal with easy cases. It is not a bad thing that some decisions take a long time. The recent Mountain View issue is a case in point. He saw the role of the Transportation Commission as a body that weighs policy. He would be interested to see how Scottsdale compares with the 30 agencies in the review, without necessarily knowing how Scottsdale would rank in

comparison. It is important to understand how petitions work in the process. He commented that the concept of 100 percent participation in petitions is thought provoking. It might be possible to refine the petition process. He welcomed the concern to use common sense. When there is a question of changing the status quo, the process is far more important than the outcome.

Commissioner Howard agreed with Commissioner Hill's remarks. The important point is being sure the process is carried through so everyone feels they had their say. The Commission should review controversial cases so that they are heard in a public forum.

Chairman Gilliland commented that as citizens learn about different options, they often change their opinions. This is one possible argument for the use of temporary installations. He was delighted with all the information the consultant had provided.

5. **CURRENT TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS UPDATES**

Ms. O'Connor announced that the Loop 101 photo enforcement program kicks off this weekend.

Commissioner McCall noted that widespread publicity should ensure that the vast majority of citizens already know about the program. She asked staff what the average speed on the Loop 101 is.

Mr. Porell replied that the issue of average speed on a freeway is a moot point, because there are significant periods of time when traffic is traveling at much lower speeds during peak periods. To attempt to calculate an average speed on the freeway by combining speeds during heavy commuter traffic periods with other times of day would yield a misleading number. Data has been gathered showing that during off-peak periods, approximately 50 percent of the vehicles were traveling above 76 miles per hour.

Ms. O'Connor said that one of the benefits of the demonstration program is that it will provide data on speed and volume, which is not currently available.

Commissioner McCall asked how collision rates on Frank Lloyd Wright have been affected. Mr. Porell responded that since the photo enforcement was introduced, there have been no fatal collisions. Previously there were three collision deaths on that road.

Ms. O'Connor reminded the Commission that the overall goal of the program is to make travel safer. The program supplements law enforcement officers and does not replace them. She proceeded to give an updated presentation on the program.

Commissioner McCall remarked that she was happy to see the cameras are mounted on the freeway underpasses and not in a location that could be distracting. She asked how the decision to locate the devices had been reached.

Mr. Porell explained that the first idea was to locate the cameras behind structures to minimize the risk of potential damage due to collisions. In the stretch from Cactus to Raintree there are no roadside barriers. All cameras are installed on breakaway bases to minimize damage to vehicles in the event of a collision. It was never the intention of the program to place hidden cameras. The intent of the program is to inform motorists that they should not travel at excessive speed.

Commissioner McCall asked whether ADOT was concerned about the cameras being a distraction.

Mr. Porell said there had been a concern about camera flashes having a distracting effect. Staff considers this to be an urban myth. The information from our vendor is that in the last 20 years there has not been a single reported case of a flash from a photo enforcement device causing a collision.

Commissioner Bruz asked whether the website gives the locations of the devices. Mr. Porell said that the City's Photo Enforcement website page indicates these locations.

Commissioner Bruz asked what the effective range of the cameras is. Mr. Porell explained that the pavement sensors are imbedded in the pavement. The total enforcement zone of the cameras and the flash units is no greater than 200 feet.

Chairman Gilliland asked whether the sensors require regular calibration or maintenance.

Mr. Porell replied that the in-pavement sensors are not calibrated. They are either on or off. The actual calculation of speed is based on a time/distance measurement.

Vice-Chairman Davis asked why fixed sensors were chosen for the photo enforcement program rather than mobile sensors.

Mr. Porell said the mobile units use radar, which has limitations in a multi-lane environment. Placing an operator on the side of the freeway would be a safety concern. In answer to a further question from Vice-Chair Davis, Mr. Porell said the sensors can detect and photograph speeders in all three lanes. Ms. O'Connor added that staff would be available to the media at 5:00 a.m. tomorrow.

Commissioner Hill expressed thanks to the Department and the City for implementing the demonstration project. This is a progressive initiative worth trying and worthy of the Scottsdale community.

Reading from page 8 of the December minutes, Commissioner McCall noted that Mr. Porell had said, "ADOT is always concerned about safety. Because this work did involve construction, they were concerned that the City identify safe locations for the placement of the cameras, which will be behind currently existing barriers."

Mr. Porell explained that at four of the six locations, staff had identified sites where the installations could be made behind existing barriers. At the two locations that did not have barriers available, they chose locations where it is least likely that collisions might run off the road.

Ms. O'Connor gave a brief design update on the Scottsdale Road projects, as well as an update on the status of the 96th Street project. A citizen had sent an e-mail request for an update on the 96th Street project. The contractor defaulted in mid December and a new contractor should be hired by the end of this week. The effect on the overall cost of the project is covered by the project performance bond. Change orders have not increased the budget for the project.

Staff had specified single-trunked trees for the splitter island at the Sweetwater roundabout. Some multi-trunked trees were planted in error, and the new contractor will remove them. Updated information about the project is available to the public on the City's website. The project is expected to be completed within three months.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

7. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Chairman Gilliland commented that this was an excellent meeting. Staff brought good information on important topics and Commissioner comments and suggestions were excellent.

8. **ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to discuss, being duly moved and seconded, the meeting adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

***NOTE: VIDEO AND/OR AUDIO RECORDINGS OF SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE AVAILABLE FROM THE SCOTTSDALE TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR UP TO SIX MONTHS FOLLOWING THE MEETING DATE.**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE ARIZONA REVISED STATUTES, THE SUMMARIZED MINUTES OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETINGS ARE NOT VERBATIM TRANSCRIPTS. ONLY THE ACTIONS TAKEN AND DISCUSSION APPEARING WITH QUOTATION MARKS ARE VERBATIM.

SUBMITTED BY:

A/V Tronics

Officially approved by the Transportation Commission on _____